

IN THE SUPREME COURT
STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA

2024 ND 12

Amanda Stancel,	Plaintiff and Appellee
v.	
Christopher Stancel,	Defendant and Appellant
and	
State of North Dakota,	Statutory Real Party in Interest

No. 20230287

Appeal from the District Court of Williams County, Northwest Judicial District, the Honorable Joshua B. Rustad, Judge.

AFFIRMED.

Per Curiam.

Jeff L. Nehring, Williston, ND, for plaintiff and appellee.

William C. Black, Bismarck, ND, for defendant and appellant.

Stancel v. Stancel, et al.
No. 20230287

Per Curiam.

[¶1] Christopher Stancel appeals from a district court divorce judgment and an order denying cross motions for contempt.

[¶2] Christopher Stancel argues the district court erred in concluding the parties had a long-term marriage, awarding Amanda Stancel non-rehabilitative spousal support, its consideration of the best interest factors, and awarding Amanda Stancel primary residential responsibility of their children. “A finding of fact is clearly erroneous if it is induced by an erroneous view of the law, if no evidence exists to support it, or if, after reviewing the entire record, we are left with a definite and firm conviction a mistake has been made.” *Friesner v. Friesner*, 2019 ND 30, ¶ 6, 921 N.W.2d 898. We conclude the court’s findings regarding the duration of the parties’ marriage, the type, amount, and duration of spousal support, consideration of the best interest factors, and primary residential responsibility are not clearly erroneous.

[¶3] Christopher Stancel also argues the district court abused its discretion by denying his motion for contempt. We conclude the court did not abuse its discretion when it denied the motion for contempt. *See Anderson v. Anderson*, 2023 ND 86, ¶ 11, 990 N.W.2d 581. We summarily affirm under N.D.R.App.P. 35.1(a)(2) and (4).

[¶4] Jon J. Jensen, C.J.
Daniel J. Crothers
Lisa Fair McEvers
Jerod E. Tufte
Douglas A. Bahr